REMARKS

Claims 29-42 were pending in the application.

Claims 29, 34, 38, and 42 are amended. No new subject matter is added. Claims 29-42 remain in the case for consideration. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 29-42 are requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 29, 34, 38 and 42 were rejected as being unpatentable over Batchelor, Yang, and DiMambro. The Applicant traverses the rejections for the reasons that follow.

Claim 29, as amended, recites "receiving, at a bridge device, a read request across an expansion bus from an expansion device to a portion of a system memory predetermined to have descriptor addresses." Claims 34, 38 and 42 are amended to recite similar features as claim 29. *See* Specification, page 4, lines 5-6.

The Examiner acknowledges that Batchelor does not teach wherein the portion of system memory is predetermined to have descriptor addresses. *See* Office Action, page 3, lines 14-15.

Yang teaches a network adaptor 20 (the Examiner has identified the network adaptor 20 as disclosing the recited bridge device in claim 29) that examines each buffer descriptor in the buffer descriptor transmit ring 43 to see if their associated buffers 54-57 contain data to be transmitted out onto the network 30. "If a buffer has a data packet to be transmitted, the packet is transferred out onto the network." *See* Yang, Col. 3, lines 26-43.

Specifically, Yang teaches that the CPU 35 signals the network adaptor 20 when there is data to be transmitted. Alternatively, Yang's network adaptor 20 polls the buffer descriptors in the buffer descriptor transmit ring 43 for their status and transmits data from the buffer without prompting from the CPU 35. *See* Yang, Col. 3, lines 26-55. Yang does not mention or suggest

"receiving, at a bridge device, a read request across an expansion bus from an expansion device to a portion of a system memory predetermined to have descriptor addresses."

DiMambro does not cure the deficiencies of Batchelor and Yang. DiMambro teaches a descriptor reclaiming process, separate from the packet posting process, to reduce packet transmission delay through a communication interface. *See* DiMambro, page 1, paragraph [0005]. But DiMambro fails to disclose a bridge device, much less in "receiving, at a bridge device, a read request across an expansion bus from an expansion device to a portion of a system memory predetermined to have descriptor addresses."

Claim 29, as amended, further recites "transmitting the descriptor blocks from the bridge device to the expansion device across the expansion bus." Claims 34, 38, and 42 recite similar features as claim 29. *See* Specification, page 4, lines 21-22.

The Examiner acknowledges that Batchelor does not teach this feature. *See* Office Action, page 3, last two lines.

As discussed above, Yang teaches a network adaptor 20 that examines each buffer descriptor in the buffer descriptor transmit ring to detect if the associated buffers contain data to be transmitted out onto the network 30. *See* Yang, Col. 3, lines 26-43. Yang does not disclose "transmitting the descriptor blocks from the bridge device to the expansion device across the expansion bus," nor does it have a reason to do so. In Yang, once the network adaptor 20 detects data in the associated transmit buffers, the network adaptor 20 will immediately transmit the available data packet to the network 30.

DiMambro does not cure the deficiencies of Batchelor and Yang. DiMambro fails to disclose a bridge device, much less in "transmitting the descriptor blocks from the bridge device to the expansion device across the expansion bus."

For at least the reasons discussed, claims 29, 34, 38, and 42 are patentably distinguishable over Batchelor, Yang, and DiMambro, and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 30, 31, 35, 36, 39 and 40 were rejected as being unpatentable over Batchelor, Yang, and DiMambro as applied to claims 29, 34, 38 and 42, and further in view of Berry. Claims 32, 37 and 41 were rejected as being unpatentable over Batchelor, Yang, and DiMambro as applied to claims 29, 34, 38 and 42, and further in view of Schumann. Claim 33 was rejected as being unpatentable over Batchelor, Yang, and DiMambro, and further in view of Ong.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the addition of Berry, Schumann, or Ong does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of Batchelor, Yang, and DiMambro as set forth in detail above with regard to the independent claims 29, 34, 38, and 42 from which these claims depend. It is therefore submitted that claims 29-31, 33-36, 38-40, and 42 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, applicant believes the application should be in condition for allowance. If any questions remain, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

_____

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

210 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613